

**CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.**  
COUNSELLORS AT LAW

CHARLES C. CARELLA  
BRENDAN T. BYRNE  
PETER G. STEWART  
ELLIOT M. OLSTEIN  
ARTHUR T. VANDERBILT, II  
JAN ALAN BRODY  
JOHN M. AGNELLO  
CHARLES M. CARELLA  
JAMES E. CECCHI

JAMES D. CECCHI (1933-1995)  
JOHN G. GILFILLAN III (1936-2008)

JAMES T. BYERS  
DONALD F. MICELI  
A. RICHARD ROSS  
KENNETH L. WINTERS  
JEFFREY A. COOPER  
CARL R. WOODWARD, III  
MELISSA E. FLAX  
DENNIS F. GLEASON  
DAVID G. GILFILLAN  
G. GLENNON TROUBLEFIELD  
BRIAN H. FENLON  
LINDSEY H. TAYLOR  
CAROLINE F. BARTLETT

**5 BECKER FARM ROAD  
ROSELAND, N.J. 07068-1739  
PHONE (973) 994-1700  
FAX (973) 994-1744  
www.carellabyrne.com**

RICHARD K. MATANLE, II  
FRANCIS C. HAND  
AVRAM S. EULE  
RAYMOND W. FISHER  
OF COUNSEL

RAYMOND J. LILLIE  
WILLIAM SQUIRE  
ALAN J. GRANT<sup>o</sup>  
STEPHEN R. DANEK  
ERIC MAGNELLI  
DONALD A. ECKLUND  
AUDRA E. PETROLLE  
MEGAN A. NATALE  
AMANDA J. BARISICH  
ZACHARY S. BOWER+  
MICHAEL CROSS

<sup>o</sup>MEMBER NY BAR ONLY  
+MEMBER FL BAR ONLY

September 13, 2012

**VIA ECF**

Honorable Jose L. Linares, U.S.D.J.  
United States District Court  
M.L. King, Jr. Federal Building & Courthouse  
50 Walnut Street  
Newark, New Jersey 07101

**Re: *Larson, et al. v. Sprint, et al.*  
Civil Action No. 07-5325 (JLL)**

Dear Judge Linares:

We are co-counsel for the Class in the above matter. We object to the request by counsel for objector Jessica Hall, Brad Lakin, to adjourn the settlement conference presently set for September 25 at 10 a.m. (Docket Entry 680)

First, Mr. Lakin has never personally attended *any* prior proceedings in this matter, so we do not understand why his presence at this conference is suddenly so vital. More importantly, the purported reason why he wishes to attend, his personal involvement with negotiating with Sprint prior to the negotiation of this Settlement, has nothing to do with the issues that need to be addressed at the conference, *i.e.*, notice and the “donut hole” issue. Rather, Mr. Lakin’s negotiations with Sprint relate to his reverse-auction claim, which the Court previously found was “baseless”. *Larson v. Sprint*, 2010 WL 234934, at \*13 (D.N.J. 2010). The Third Circuit upheld that finding. *Larson v. AT&T Mobility*, 687 F.3d 109, 120 n. 18 (3d Cir. 2012) (“We conclude that the District Court did not abuse its discretion in rejecting Hall’s [reverse auction] objection.”) Thus, Mr. Lakin’s personal knowledge relates to an issue which has already been resolved both by this Court and by the Third Circuit.

Class Counsel believes that it is much more important to have the conference go forward as scheduled, so that, hopefully, the important outstanding issues may be resolved and Class members can finally get the relief to which they are entitled under the Settlement. If there are any outstanding issues with Mr. Lakin, which we do not believe there are, they can be addressed separately at another time.

Honorable Jose L. Linares, U.S.D.J.  
September 13, 2012  
Page 2

Thank you for your continued attention to this matter. If the Court wishes to discuss these issues further, we are available at your convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI,  
OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO

/s/ James E. Cecchi

JAMES E. CECCHI

cc: All counsel (via ECF)